

## UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RECIPIENT NATIONS OIL-FOR-FOOD PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House tonight and the opportunity to discuss the issue that is in the front of the American consciousness, and that is the issue of the United Nations and the involvement of the members of the United Nations with the world policy and how things have evolved from the United Nations world policy with regard to Iraq and the Iraqi Oil-for-Food program that has been going on now since about the middle 1990s.

As the Speaker will remember, and the people in this country will remember, the sanctions that were against the United Nations that were established after Desert Storm were lifted, to some degree, to allow the Iraqi government under Saddam Hussein to trade existing oil production that they had for humanitarian supplies, which included food and medicine, into Iraq, and the structure of the Oil-for-Food program that was established there and the bureaucracy of the United Nations and the \$10.1 billion that we believe has been scooped out of that program and gone into the pockets of bureaucrats at the expense of the Iraqi people and of course the expense of the credibility of the United Nations themselves.

Now, I would first like to back up a little bit and describe who the United Nations really are, and there is a misconception in this country that the United Nations, since there is someone seated there from every member nation and each nation has a voice and each nation has a vote and we have five members of the permanent Security Council and we have a total of five members of the Security Council, the other members which rotate, we get the perception and we make the mistake that the United Nations somehow represents the will of the people of the world, that its democratic governments, or I should say in my preference is constitutional republican governments, that send their representatives there that are the voice of the people that now speak at the United Nations. And in fact, that is quite a ways from the truth.

Some nations do do that. Free nations do that, but there are nations there and many of them are represented by dictators, who, if they are not speaking for themselves, their representative speaks for them. The people in those countries do not have the ability or do not have the right to speak up for themselves. They do not have the chance to go to the polls and vote nor direct their national destiny or determine who their leader will be that directs their national destiny.

So the United Nations has become, over the years, an organization that I term to be a third-world class and de-

bate society, and the structure of the United Nations is not democratic. It is not representative. It is simply the voices of the nations of the world rather than the voices of the people of the world.

Well, then enter the Oil-for-Food program. Yes, we had humanitarian interests in Iraq, and there is no nation on this globe that has more commitment towards the people of Iraq than the United States of America, but we went along with and supported the concept of an Oil-for-Food program, and what we got was a program that enriched the bureaucrats, enriched the Saddam Hussein regime to the tune of \$10.1 billion.

And here is a little bit of the structure of how that works on this easel to my left. This red represents the greatest recipient nation of the scoop of oil for food. Now, that is Russia, and then the rest of this colored spectrum here are these other nations along the way, all in differing degrees. France, a major player, of course. We would expect that. China a major player. This is just a sample of some of the money that has gone to these nations.

I took a look at the resistance to America's interests in going into the nation of Iraq prior to our invasion and occupation there, and I wondered why was it that the resonance of the resistance to American policy was so strong and so great. And I asked at the time, do they have financial interests there? What are their interests?

Well, one of the things, is oil for food. Some of these countries stood to profit a great deal from the Oil-for-Food program. This gives a little better perspective on where these interests came from. This is broken down by continent. The big blue is Europe, and that does include Russia, Germany, and France. Eighty-seven percent of the Oil-for-Food scoop that we know at this point, or we believe allegedly at this point, that came out of that program that should have gone to the benefit of the Iraqi people really went to Europe itself; and these are the countries, by the way, that stood up and opposed our policy in Iraq.

So I took the Security Council itself, and I broke it down into five nations, Russia, France, China, Great Britain and the United States, and asked the question, what percentage then of the Oil-for-Food profits that were going out of that program off the tables of the Iraqi people was going into these countries of the Security Council, the permanent members of the Security Council, those five members?

Three of those nations collected 99.1 percent of that money that should have gone to the Iraqi people, at least by the numbers that we have in front of us today; 99.1 percent went to Russia, France and China together. None of those nations supported our policy in Iraq. All of them opposed us in differing degrees of disagreement and aggressiveness, but I think that tells us that the decibels of their resistance

were indexed to the Oil-for-Food program in some part.

And in another part, and I do not have the chart here tonight, how many oil development contracts did they have prepared that would give them an opportunity to develop that if Saddam would have stayed in power in Iraq? We will index that another time.

And additionally, I am just going to quickly show this policy here. This is the flowchart of some of the Oil-for-Food scam that went on and this Congress needs to look into this, and we need to get the answers, and we need to do a full investigation within the United Nations. This is far too complicated to explain. This is simply a commercial so that I can come up another time and explain it to you. Madam Speaker, I will bring this back another night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I come tonight to report on the activity of the House policy committee this week. The Subcommittee on Health met for a hearing on medical liability insurance, and the purpose of this meeting was to outline in the current concept of medical liability reform and to point to some of the proven successes and to look at the future of reform. This meeting, which was held on Tuesday of this week, was attended by Jose Montemayor, who is the insurance commissioner of the State of Texas. Mr. Montemayor was appointed by then-Governor George Bush and has continued in that capacity since 1998.

We were also joined by Dr. Brennan Cassidy, a board-certified emergency physician from the State of California, who spoke on the status of tort reform in that State.

Paul Bahcarach, the president and CEO of Uniontown Hospital, was at our meeting and spoke about the particular problems that they are experiencing in Pennsylvania.

And Donald Palmisano, a physician and lawyer from New Orleans, who is the past president of the American Medical Association, spoke to us with considerable passion on what he believed some of the answers might be in the arena of tort reform.

First, Commissioner Montemayor from Texas talked about what he had seen in Texas since the passage of a major piece of tort reform legislation in Texas last year at the end of the regular State legislative session; and then

in September of last year, September 2003, a constitutional amendment was passed in the State of Texas which allowed this legislation to take effect.

In Texas, Commissioner Montemayor had seen his number of liability insurers, the number of companies that wrote insurance for physicians in Texas, decline from a high of 17 to a low of four; and Commissioner Montemayor correctly recognized that if that situation continued, medical practice as we know it was going to disappear from the State of Texas.

Texas is a large State, and very different regions were affected differently. The Rio Grande Valley was particularly hard hit, not necessarily in the dollar amounts that were awarded by juries in that region, but more so just by the sheer number of lawsuits. Most practitioners and physicians in that area could be expected to be sued three or four times a year, oftentimes for sums of money not exceeding \$100,000, but still the time away from family and practice in defending those lawsuits and the wear and tear on a doctor's soul was considerable in that portion of the State.

Right before the constitutional amendment passed, there was a significant increase in the filing of lawsuits in the State of Texas; but since the constitutional amendment passed, the number of suits has dropped precipitously.

□ 2300

Commissioner Montemayor also pointed out to us that there are companies that are reducing their insurance rates to physicians in Texas as a result of this legislation, a constitutional amendment that was passed. And, in fact, Texas Medical Liability Trust, my old insurer of record, has reduced their rates by 12 percent this year.

Another insurer who sought a rate increase and, in fact, had received a rate increase of over 100 percent in the State of Oklahoma and 39 percent in the State of Florida actually is going to receive no rate increase in the State of Texas this year.

So it has been good news on not only the number of insurers that is available which has now increased to 12 but also the rates paid by hospitals and physicians in Texas has significantly reduced.

Commissioner Montemayor told us that he thought hospitals had fared somewhat better than physicians in this new day that has dawned in the State of Texas.

Dr. Cassidy, the emergency physician from California, was there in 1975 in California when the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975 was passed in California by a Governor of California who was on the Democratic side, Jerry Brown, past candidate for president.

But Dr. Cassidy related how the \$250,000 cap on non-economic damages had stood the test of time, and in fact he had some rather graphic evidence

showing how rates in that State had stayed relatively stable while rates across the country had exploded.

Paul Bahcarach, the chief executive officer of Uniontown, Pennsylvania hospital where the situation has far from improved, in fact, the situation has deteriorated in Pennsylvania significantly over the past years, told some rather poignant stories of the inability to hire, to attract physicians to the State of Pennsylvania. He was not able to cover services that he wanted to provide; and, in fact, he told of a service area of 148,000 people that was serviced by one single ear, nose and throat physician. If I have done my arithmetic right, that is about one ENT doctor for 300,000 ears, which is a lot of ears to be responsible for in a community.

Dr. Palmisano, the general surgeon from New Orleans who has been the past president of the American Medical Association, again spoke with a good deal of passion on what he saw as some of the solutions available to us. We will talk about this in rights to come.

Dr. Palmisano gave excellent testimony on how the doctors in this country are engaged and see this as a real problem, threatening to their profession.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, while the Nation has been watching the Presidential campaign and the events in Iraq, the Republicans in the House have been moving forward with an agenda to bring jobs back into America.

Now, we have seen a lot of economic success over the last year. Just as a reminder, back in 1999 we had the first hit to our then strong economy when we had the tech bubble burst. We had a lot of technical industries lose a great deal of value. The NASDAQ, which typically has tech companies as the companies that trade on that exchange, the value of that exchange dropped dramatically to less than half. So the tech bubble burst.

Then in 2000 we had the beginning of the recession towards the end of the year. Technically, it started in the end of 2000 prior to President Bush being sworn into office. That had an impact on our economy.

Then, of course, there was the events of September 11, when terrorists took our own technology and turned it into a weapon and attacked the Pentagon and Washington, D.C., and tore down the World Trade Center, killing nearly 3,000 people. That had a dramatic impact on our economy.

It was not any policy of the Republican administration. It was not any policies that came out of the Republican House. It was events that occurred, as I just discussed, beyond the circumstances of Congress. Those events, though, have turned around since we passed tax relief.

Tax relief has been very beneficial to the American economy because people can only do one of three things when